This second procedure is much more complex than the first but is nomenclaturally more correct and, without any doubt, more logical than the proposals of Krell, Stebnicka & Holm.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Lithobius piceus* L. Koch, 1862 (Chilopoda)
(Case 2919; see BZN **51**: 133–134)

Alessandro Minelli
Dipartimento di Biologia, Università di Padova, Via Trieste 75, I-135121 Padova, Italy

I wish to express my full support for Dr E.H. Eason's application proposing the conservation of the specific name of the centipede *Lithobius piceus* L. Koch, 1862.

Comment on the proposed conservation of HEMIDACTYLIINI Hallowell, 1856 (Amphibia, Caudata)
(Case 2869; see BZN **50**: 129–132; **51**: 153–156, 264–265)

Hobart M. Smith
Department of EPO Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309–0334, U.S.A.

David B. Wake
Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, U.S.A.

We respond to Prof Dubois's comment (published in BZN **51**: 264–265) on our application.

1. At the time that Dubois (1984) revived MYCETOGLOSSINI Bonaparte, 1850 to replace HEMIDACTYLIINI Hallowell, 1856 (which had been adopted by Wake, 1966, for the first time since its proposal), HEMIDACTYLIINI had been used (note the 'non-exhaustive' list in para. 4 of the application) in at least 10 works by nine authors, and by the time that our application was submitted those figures had increased to at least 16 and 15 respectively.

2. Article 23b of the current (1985) Code came into effect on 1 January 1973 and was therefore operating at the time that Dubois (1984) adopted MYCETOGLOSSINI. This Article states: 'The Principle of Priority is to be used to promote stability and is not intended to be used to upset a long-accepted name in its accustomed meaning through the introduction of an unused name that is its senior synonym'. Therefore, Bonaparte's name should not automatically have been adopted by Dubois and, accordingly, it would have been correct for authors to continue to use HEMIDACTYLIINI after Dubois pointed out the earlier family-group name, whilst referring the problem to the Commission.

3. We requested the suppression of MYCETOGLOSSINI in conformance with Article 79 and within the spirit of the current Code. The Code encourages nomenclatural stability by permitting the suppression (under the plenary powers) of long-unused names that threaten established, current usage. Admittedly Cope (1889), Dunn (1926) and Wake (1966) overlooked Bonaparte's name but this was not then known

in the active literature, and in 1966 the name was a 'nomen oblitum' and could not have been adopted without Commission action, even if known (Article 23b(ii) of the 1964 Code). Names unused for over 100 years and buried in unused literature are easily overlooked, and have been so countless times by reputable and diligent taxonomists; the belated discovery of such names is not to the discredit of reasonable nomenclatural search.

4. Article 80 of the current Code makes it plain that Wake's (1993) exhortation for 'maintaining the traditional taxonomy until the matter receives formal action' (cited by Dubois in his comment, para. 3) is the explicit regulation under the Code, and not just a personal stand.

5. In the present case no useful purpose would be served by upsetting the established usage for nearly 30 years of a family-group name by one never used since its proposal over 100 years ago, based on a never-used generic name. It is to prevent that sort of mindless adherence to priority that the provisions of Article 79 exist.

Additional references

Cope, E.D. 1889. The Batrachia of North America. *Bulletin of the United States National Museum*, **34**: 1–525.

Dunn, A. 1926. *The salamanders of the family Plethodontidae*. viii, 441 pp. Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.

Comments on the proposed conservation of some mammal generic names first published in Brisson's (1762) *Regnum Animale*
(Case 2928; see BZN **51**: 135–146, 266–267)

(1) Colin P. Groves
Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T. 0200, Australia

I fully support this application.

1. Brisson's (1762) work should finally be suppressed. It is not binominal and indeed, bearing in mind its early date, there is no reason why it should have been. Yet a number of mammalian generic names in common use have traditionally been dated from the book, and would be threatened were its suppression not accompanied by action for their conservation.

2. The cases of *Tragulus* and *Cuniculus* are especially horrendous. The long-standing fixation of *Cervus javanicus* Osbeck as the type of *Tragulus* (by Ellerman & Morrison-Scott, 1951, as noted by Gentry) depends on the maintenance of Brisson's name; the type of the next available usage of *Tragulus* (i.e. Pallas, 1767) is *Capra pygmaea*, the Royal antelope, which is currently placed in *Neotragus* H. Smith, 1827. Thus we would have:

	Current usage	Prospective name
Royal antelope	*Neotragus pygmaeus*	*Tragulus pygmaeus*
Lesser mouse-deer	*Tragulus javanicus*	*Moschiola javanica*

This would be an unpleasant and confusing double change of nomenclature.

3. The type of *Cuniculus* Brisson has been fixed as *Mus paca*, the paca. The next available generic name for this species is *Agouti* Lacepède, 1799, a word which is the